

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NO. 2020-125-E

IN RE: Application of Dominion Energy South)
Carolina, Incorporated for Adjustment of)
Rates and Charges)

**JOINT MOTION
FOR APPROVAL OF
COMPREHENSIVE SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT RESOLVING ALL
ISSUES AMONG THE PARTIES**

Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc. (“DESC” or “Company”), the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff (“ORS”), South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs, AARP South Carolina, the South Carolina Energy Users Committee, the South Carolina Coastal Conservation League, the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, the United States Department of Defense and all other Federal Executive Agencies, the Sierra Club, Walmart Inc., and Frank Knapp, Jr. (collectively the “Parties”) hereby move the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (“Commission”) for an order approving the comprehensive settlement agreement entered into among the Parties on July 1, 2021, that resolves all outstanding issues in this case.

In furtherance of the comprehensive settlement agreement, the Parties also move that at the outset of the merits hearing scheduled to begin on July 12, 2021, the Commission allow the Parties to introduce testimony and evidence in support of the comprehensive settlement agreement. After presenting such testimony and evidence in support of the comprehensive settlement agreement, if the Commission desires to hear from any witness who has not yet testified but pre-filed testimony prior to the date of the comprehensive settlement agreement, then the Parties hereby move that the Commission identify those witnesses and allow the Parties to present them for Commission examination on July 14, 2021.

In support of this Motion, the Parties would respectfully show this Commission the following key facts and would request of and move the Commission for the following relief:

1. The Company initiated this matter by filing an Application seeking an adjustment and increases in its electric schedules and tariffs. See Application filed August 14, 2020.
2. The Company, ORS, and the Intervenors conducted extensive discovery related to the matters raised in the Application and the requests made by the Company. ORS also completed an extensive audit and examination of the books and records of the Company relative to the matters raised in the Application; to test-period revenues and expenses; to rate base, depreciation, and capital expenditures; to taxes paid by the Company; and to other relevant accounting matters.
3. This matter proceeded to hearing beginning on January 5, 2021. On January 11, 2021, the Commission granted a six-month pause to, *inter alia*, “allow the parties to discuss settlement.” See Order No. 2021-18; see also Stipulation of Parties filed January 12, 2021.
4. The six-month pause granted to the Parties by the Commission was extremely beneficial and provided the Parties with the necessary time to engage in settlement discussion. As a result of the Commission’s action, the settlement discussions proved fruitful. After negotiations, the Parties¹ are pleased to report that they have reached a comprehensive settlement agreement. That settlement agreement resolves all issues pending before the Commission and has been contemporaneously filed with the Commission.

¹ These moving parties can represent that CMC Steel South Carolina does not oppose this comprehensive settlement agreement.

5. The settlement of the issues would be in each Intervenor's best interests and, in the case of ORS and the Department of Consumer Affairs, the public and consumer interest, respectively, would be best served through the adoption of this comprehensive settlement on the terms and conditions set forth in the settlement agreement.
6. The Parties request that at the outset of the merits hearing scheduled to begin on July 12, 2021, the Commission allow the Parties to introduce testimony and evidence in support of the comprehensive settlement agreement.
7. After presenting such testimony and evidence in support of the comprehensive settlement agreement, if the Commission desires to hear from any witness who has not yet testified but pre-filed testimony prior to the date of the comprehensive settlement agreement, then the Parties respectfully request that the Commission identify those witnesses and allow the Parties to present them for Commission examination on July 14, 2021.
8. If the Commission grants this motion, then on July 12, 2021, the Parties would present the merits of the settlement agreement to the Commission, introduce the settlement agreement, and provide settlement testimony through witnesses appearing on the stand before the Commission to support the settlement terms and conditions.
9. The witnesses supporting the settlement agreement would be available for questioning from the Commission at that time.
10. The Commission could decide to approve the settlement at the conclusion of the settlement testimony.
11. In the alternative, after presenting such testimony and evidence in support of the comprehensive settlement agreement, if the Commission desires to hear from any

witness who has not yet testified but pre-filed testimony prior to the date of the comprehensive settlement agreement, then the Parties respectfully request that the Commission identify those witnesses and allow the Parties to present them for Commission examination on July 14, 2021, as follows.

- a. At the time of the pause of the proceedings, 23 witnesses who pre-filed testimony remained to testify. The Company had 3 witnesses remaining in its case, ORS has noticed 10 witnesses, and the Intervenors have collectively 10 witnesses.
 - b. Resumption of the hearing on July 14th would provide the Commission with the opportunity to receive testimony and question any of the 23 pre-filed witnesses that remained to testify at the time this matter paused—should the Commission even desire to receive oral testimony and question any of the remaining 23 witnesses who pre-filed testimony.
 - c. The Parties request that the Commission identify by July 12th which witness or witnesses, if any, that the Parties should have available to the Commission. That would give the witnesses the time needed to prepare for testimony and questioning by the Commission should the hearing need to resume on July 14th.
12. By advising the Parties by July 12th which pre-filed witness testimony, if any, that the Commission wishes to question, the Parties will be able to coordinate the stipulation of the pre-filed testimony into the record. The Parties, pursuant to the settlement agreement, have agreed to stipulate the testimony of the 23 pre-filed witnesses into the record through counsel of record and such stipulated testimony would be accepted into the record as if given orally from the stand. The stipulations could occur on the 12th if

- the Commission does not seek further questions on the pre-filed testimony or on July 14th when the hearing reconvenes, if needed, for Commission questioning. The parties have also agreed to waive any cross-examination of those witnesses and respectfully request that the stipulated witnesses be excused from any further participating in the proceeding unless the Commission desires to examine them on July 14, 2021.
13. This approach of beginning with settlement testimony and proceeding on July 14th on an as-needed basis with only the testimony of the pre-filed witnesses, if any, identified by the Commission would allow significant cost savings for the parties as well as ratepayers by saving significant preparation and hearing time costs for the Company, ORS, and Intervenors.
14. The Parties agree that this more efficient and cost-effective method would best provide the information and witnesses necessary for the Commission to confirm that the settlement agreement produces rates that are just and reasonable, provides other significant and meaningful customer benefits, and is in the public interest.
15. The Parties further request that the hearing officer set a status conference on the morning of July 6, 2021, to assist the Commission render a decision on this motion expeditiously so the parties can prepare for the resumption of the hearing in the most cost-effective manner.

Wherefore, the Parties respectfully request the Commission grant this motion (1) to resume the hearing on July 12, 2021, for the limited purpose of receiving settlement testimony in support of the comprehensive settlement agreement reached by the parties, (2) to approve the comprehensive settlement agreement; and (3) recess the hearing until July 14, 2021, reconvene on

that date only on as-needed basis should the Commission require any of the remaining 23 pre-filed witnesses to present oral testimony.

We so move:

s/ Michael J. Anzelmo

Michael Anzelmo
McGuireWoods LLP
1301 Gervais Street, Suite 1050
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 251-2313
manzelmo@mcguirewoods.com

K. Chad Burgess
Matthew W. Gissendanner
Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated
Mail Code C222 220
Operation Way
Cayce, SC 29033
(803) 217-8141
kenneth.burgess@dominionenergy.com
matthew.gissendanner@dominionenergy.com

Mitchell Willoughby
Willoughby & Hoefer, P.A.
P.O. Box 8416
Columbia, SC 29202
(803) 252-3300
mwilloughby@willoughbyhoefer.com

Belton T. Zeigler
Womble Bond Dickinson (US) LLP
1221 Main Street, Suite 1600
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 454-6504
belton.zeigler@wbd-us.com

Attorneys for Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated

s/ Andrew M. Bateman

Nanette S. Edwards, Esquire
Andrew M. Bateman, Esquire
Christopher M. Huber, Esquire
Alexander W. Knowles, Esquire
Steven Hamm, Esquire
South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff
1401 Main Street, Suite 900
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone: (803) 737-8440
Fax: (803) 737-0801
nedwards@ors.sc.gov
abateman@ors.sc.gov
chuber@ors.sc.gov
aknowles@ors.sc.gov
shamm@ors.sc.gov

Attorneys for South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff

s/ Roger P. Hall

Carri Grube Lybarker, Esquire
Roger P. Hall, Esquire
Connor J. Parker, Esquire
SC Department of Consumer Affairs
293 Greystone Boulevard, Suite 400
Columbia, SC 29210
clybarker@scconsumer.gov
rhall@scconsumer.gov
cjparker@scconsumer.gov

Attorneys for South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs

s/ John B. Coffman

John B. Coffman, Esquire
John B. Coffman, LLC
871 Tuxedo Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63119-2044
john@johncoffman.net

Adam Protheroe, Esquire
South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center
P.O. Box 7187
Columbia, SC 29201
adam@scjustice.org

Attorneys for AARP South Carolina

s/ Scott Elliott

Scott Elliott, Esquire
Elliott & Elliott, P.A.
1508 Lady Street
Columbia, SC 29201
sellott@elliottlaw.us

Attorneys for South Carolina Energy Users Committee

s/ Kate Lee Mixson

Kate Lee Mixson, Esquire
Southern Environmental Law Center
525 Bay Street, Suite 200
Charleston, SC 29403
kmixson@selcsc.org

David L. Neal, Esquire
Southern Environmental Law Center
601 West Rosemary Street
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
dneal@selcnc.org

Attorneys for South Carolina Coastal Conservation League and Southern Alliance for Clean Energy

s/ Emily W. Medlyn

Emily W. Medlyn, Esquire
General Attorney
U.S. Army Legal Services Agency
Regulatory Law Office (JALS-ELD)
9275 Gunston Road
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060-4446
Telephone: (703) 614-3918
emily.w.medlyn.civ@mail.mil

Attorneys for the United States Department of Defense and all other Federal Executive Agencies

s/ Dorothy E. Jaffe

Robert Guild, Esquire
314 Pall Mall Street
Columbia, SC 29201
bguild@mindspring.com

Dorothy E. Jaffe, Esquire
Sierra Club
50 F St NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
dori.jaffe@sierraclub.org

Attorneys for Sierra Club

s/ Stephanie U. Eaton

Stephanie U. Eaton, Esquire
Carrie H. Grundmann, Esquire
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500
Winston-Salem, NC 27103
seaton@spilmanlaw.com

Attorneys for Walmart, Inc.

s/ Frank Knapp, Jr.

Frank Knapp, Jr.
118 East Selwood Lane
Columbia, SC 29212
fknapp@knappagency.com

July 2, 2021
Columbia, South Carolina